

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-24 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,044,388 (“DeBellis”).

Claims 7, 16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBellis in view of U.S. patent no. 5,696,828 (“Koopman”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Independent claims 1 and 19 each recites that the numerical sequencing resumes from the value at which it stopped. Support for this limitation may be found in Fig. 4, and the related supporting text, which shows the numerical sequencer output stopping at a value C796, and resuming from that same value when the numerical sequencer is restarted. The office action states that the reset signal 206 of DeBellis (col. 6 line 66) is the predetermined event that both starts and stops the counter of DeBellis, but it resets the value of that counter to zero (col. 6 line 66), from where the counter restarts its counting.

Independent claims 10 and 22 each recites that the hashing continues to operate while the numerical sequencing is stopped by the first predetermined event. Support for this limitation may be found in the specification in paragraph 0018 at the top of page 6. The office action indicates that the reset signal 206 of DeBellis (col. 6 line 66) is used as the first predetermined event that stops the numerical sequencer. However, the reset signal of DeBellis resets the entire cryptographic module, which stops all circuits,

including the hash circuit (col. 6 line 67), so that the hash circuit cannot continue to operate while the numerical sequencer is stopped.

Each of the remaining pending claims depends from claim 1, 10, 19 or 22, and therefore contains the same limitations not disclosed or suggested by DeBellis.

Koopman was cited solely to disclose a linear feedback shift register for claims 7 and 16, and does not make up for the aforementioned limitations that are missing from DeBellis.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: September 27, 2005

s/John F. Travis/  
John F. Travis  
Reg. No. 43,203

Attorney Telephone:

(512) 732-3918

Correspondence Address:

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026